

means for said at least one other of said at least two personal computers, when idled by a corresponding personal user, to be made available to function temporarily as at least one slave personal computer to participate in an execution of a shared computer processing operation controlled by said master personal computer;

means for said at least two personal computers to alternate as directed between functioning as a master and functioning as a slave in said shared computer processing operations;

a firewall for said at least two personal computers to limit access by said network to only a portion of hardware, software, firmware, and other components of said at least two personal computers, wherein:

A3
at least one of said personal computers includes at least two microprocessors and has a connection with said network of computers,

said firewall denies access by said network to at least one of said microprocessors, which includes means for functioning as a master microprocessor to initiate and control execution of a computer processing operation shared with at least one other microprocessor, including means for functioning as a slave microprocessor, and

said firewall permits access by said network to said slave microprocessor.

24
110. (New) The system of claim 27, wherein at least one of said at least two
4
personal computers is a special purpose appliance device.

59
111. (New) The system architecture of claim 42, wherein at least one of said at
least two personal computers is a special purpose appliance device.--

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the

following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 27-29 and 32-109 are pending, claims 27-29 and 32-51 having been amended, claims 52-111 having been added, and claims 1-26 and 30-31 having been canceled without prejudice.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for agreeing that claims 42-51 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 42-51; however Applicant submits that the amendments do not affect the allowability of the claims.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-51 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 08/980,058. Because claims 1-26 and 30-31 have been canceled without prejudice, the rejection is moot with respect to these claims. Because the co-pending claims of U.S. Patent Application 08/980,058 may change during prosecution, Applicant will consider the filing of a terminal disclaimer when the present application is otherwise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-13, 14-19 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by "A new major SETI project based on Project Serendip data and 100,000 personal computers", by Sullivan et al. ("Seti@home"). Applicant canceled the above mentioned claims without prejudice rendering the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 20-22 and 27-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Seti@home. Claims 10 and 20-22 having been canceled without prejudice, Applicant submits that the rejection is moot with regard to these claims. Applicant traverses the rejection with respect to claims 27-41.

Seti@home is a project by which a PC user could loan his or her PC to be used to process radio signals received from space. A home computer's CPU cycles are borrowed by an automatic program for the processing of the radio signals. The program that runs on each client computer looks and behaves like a screen saver. It runs only when the machine is idle, at which time the computer's CPU is borrowed to process the radio signals.

The Examiner appears to have rejected claims 27-41 because of a belief that UNIX and NT servers can be run on personal computers and can be made to function temporarily as a master personal computer or as a slave personal computer, as similarly recited in claims 27-41. However, a UNIX or an NT server functions as a server, not as a master personal computer or as a slave personal computer, which require applications not found in UNIX or NT operating systems. Therefore, Applicant submits that neither Seti@home nor a UNIX or an NT server running on personal computers discloses, teaches or suggests:

at least one of at least two personal computers, when directed by a personal user, functioning temporarily as a master personal computer to initiate and control execution of a computer processing shared operation with at least one other of the at least two personal computers in a network, the shared processing operation including one of parallel processing and multi-tasking processing;

or

at least one other of the at least two personal computers, when idled by the personal user, functioning temporarily as at least one slave personal computer to participate in the execution of a shared computer processing

operation controlled by the master personal computer.

Furthermore, Applicant wishes to remind the Examiner of the standard for a § 103 rejection, e.g., as set forth in the MPEP.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

MPEP 706.02(j), emphasis added.

The Federal Circuit has recently reiterated (*In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)) that even in a situation where each element of the claim was found among the cited references, the PTO failed to show a *prima facie* case of obviousness where there was no showing by the PTO of a motivation to combine the references. Without motivation to combine found in the references, the PTO must have used the claims as a blue print for combining the references, which is impermissible hindsight. The Court in *In re Rouffet* stated that

When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. See *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, "[w]hen determining the patentability of a claimed invention which combines two known elements, 'the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination.'" See *In re Beattie*, 974 F.2d 1309, 1311-12, 24 USPQ2d 1040, 1042 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (quoting

ELLIS -- Appln. No.: 09/320,660

Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 1462, 221 USPQ 481, 488 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

In re Rouffet, emphasis added.

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not, as the Examiner would have it, have been motivated to combine the teachings of Seti@home and UNIX or NT servers to provide the above-mentioned features. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not realize that he should pick and choose certain features of each of the references and combine the references in a certain way to arrive at the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 27-41 as now amended recite a firewall, for at least a temporary slave personal computer, allowing access, at least temporarily, to at least one microprocessor of the temporary slave personal computer by a network during a shared computer operation. Seti@home does not disclose, teach or suggest such a firewall.

For the above-mentioned reasons, as well as for reciting other important features, Applicant submits that claims 27-41 are patentable over Seti@home and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 105 and 110 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 27 and are patentable for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 27, as well as for reciting other important features.

New claims 53, 56, 58, 61, 62, 66 and 111 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 42 which the Examiner agrees is patentable.

New claims 67 through 79 and 106 correspond or relate to claims 27-29 and 32-41, respectively, but include means plus function language. Claims 67 through 79 and 106 are

ELLIS -- Appln. No.: 09/320,660

patentable at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 27.

New claims 80-89 correspond to claims 42-51, respectively, but include means plus function language. Applicant submits that claims 80-89 are patentable at least for the same reasons as claims 42-51, which the Examiner agrees are patentable.

New claims 90-104 are similar to claims 52-66, respectively, but include limitations having means plus function language. Applicants submit that the claims are patentable at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claims 52-66.

New claims 107 through 109 are similar to claims 30, 33 and 35 of related U.S. patent application 08/980,058. The Examiner of application 08/980,058 indicated that claims 30, 33 and 35 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 107-109 are allowable.

All rejections and objections having been addressed, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO LLP

By Richard C. Irving

Richard C. Irving

Reg. No. 38,499

Tel. No.: (202) 861-3788

Fax No.: (202) 822-0944

DSL/RCI:ksh
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Ninth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005-3918
(202) 861-3000